FIVE CENTS

The Suffragist

WEEKLY ORGAN OF THE
CONGRESSIONAL UNION FOR WOMAN SUFFRAGE

FEBRUARY 20, 1915

Drawn by Nina E. Allender

"LEST WE FORGET"

Vol. III February 20, 1915 No. 8

The Suffragist

Weekly Organ of the Congressional Union for Woman Suffrage

1420 F STREET N. W., WASHINGTON, D. C.

SUBSCRIPTION PRICE:

Domestic $1.00
Foreign $1.50
Single Copies .....5 cents

Checks, drafts and postoffice orders should be made payable to The Treasurer of the Congressional Union

Columbian Printing Co., Inc., Washington

35

Entered as second-class matter, Nov. 14, 1913, at the Post-Office at Washington, D. C., under act of March 3, 1879

Congressional Union for Woman Suffrage

Object—

Securing an amendment to the United States Constitution, enfranchising women.

Membership—

Open to all women who, believing that suffrage is fundamental to all democratic reform, consider suffrage the main issue in the field of National politics.

Dues—

Entrance fee of twenty-five cents. There are no other dues.

Date.....

Name .....

Full Address .....

.....

Telephone Number .....

Occupation .....

Please fill out this card and send it to 1420 F Street N. W., Washington, D. C.

News of the Week

Susan B. Anthony Memorial Fund

THE campaign to raise a fund to advance the Susan B. Anthony Amendment in Congress, in commemoration of the author of the measure, is being urgently pushed during the present week. Miss Isabella Mott, who is directing this campaign, says, "No honor to Miss Anthony's name would give her greater pleasure than a donation to further the measure she worked for so faithfully."

The Committee of One Thousand organized by Miss Mott to raise the Susan B. Anthony Memorial Fund, is growing very rapidly. There are already over one hundred and fifty members, and each day sees many more enrolled. Among the new members are Mrs. Nina E. Allender, former President of the District of Columbia Woman Suffrage Association, Mrs. George A. Armes, President of the District of Columbia Branch of the Wilson and Marshall League; Mrs. S. M. B. Young, wife of the Superintendent of Soldiers' Home, Miss Eliza Hardy Lord, former Dean of Western Reserve University, Dr. A. J. McKelway, Secretary of the National Child Labor Commission, Mrs. Berliner, Miss Jessie Baker, and Mrs. R. P. Davis.

Farm Women's Bureau

A BILL to establish a farm women's bureau in the Department of Agriculture was introduced in the House on January 27th, by Representative Keating of Colorado.

The work contemplated for the Bureau is to put the various departments of the State and Federal Governments at the service of farm women, who are engaged in research work on the farm, in rural home work, in home hygiene and the care of children. The bureau would also be directed to organize farm women into clubs, to consolidate rural schools, establish circulating libraries, form social centers for women, and investigate the problem of female help on the farm. The bill provides for the appointment of a woman as head of this bureau.

The mere introduction of this bill is notable as a first attempt to use the Department of Agriculture for the needs of women.

Federal Child Labor Bill

THE Child Labor Bill passed the House on Monday, February 15, by a vote of 233 to 43.

A two-thirds vote on the measure was necessary to suspend the rules and secure time to consider the measure.

The bill now goes to the Senate, where there is little chance for its consideration before March 4. Mr. Mitchell Palmer, who proposed the Child Labor Bill in the House, will not retain his seat next session.

It is interesting to note the character of the opposition vote upon the bill. Of the 43 votes against the measure, 39 came from the South. Nine adverse votes came from Georgia, seven from North Carolina, six from Texas, six from Mississippi, three from Alabama, four from South Carolina, two from Virginia, and one each from Florida and Kentucky.—Delaware, New York, Illinois and Oklahoma each cast one adverse vote against this bill. Every single Representative who voted against the children's bill voted also against the Suffrage Amendment on January 12th, except Mr. Beall of Georgia, who paired against Woman Suffrage, and Mr. O'Hair of Illinois, who voted in favor of it.

Republican Party Recognizes Suffrage

ANNOUNCEMENT was made this week that the new plan of representation in the next Republican National Convention had been adopted by a sufficient number of States.

According to this plan an additional delegate is given each Congressional district in which the vote for a Republican nominee for Congress in 1914 shall have been not less than 7,500.

Women voted for Congressmen in nine States in 1914. This means that the vote of all parties was much larger than it would have been without equal suffrage. The suffrage States will have a larger proportional representation in the Republican convention than the non-suffrage States.

Suffrage in the State Legislatures

THE *Washington Post* of February 13 says:

"The action of the 63rd Congress in breaking all precedents and allowing the woman suffrage amendment to come to a vote is having a marked effect on state legislatures. This week sees the lapse of a month since the vote was taken in the House on January 12th on the Bristow-Mondell Amendment to the Federal Constitution. During that time suffrage successes have followed one another in various state legislatures with a rapidity that is unprecedented in the history of the movement."

Suffrage Resolution before Wisconsin Legislature

SENATOR GLENN introduced, on February 12th, a companion to the Joint Resolution offered in the House providing for a referendum vote on equal suffrage in 1916. Both these resolutions will be considered in committee hearings and will be argued, pro and con, at a public mass meeting in the Assembly Chamber.

Two More Campaign States

BY a vote of 196 to 33, the Massachusetts House of Representatives on February 16th, passed a Constitutional amendment proposing to strike the word "male" from the list of qualifications for voters. This amendment has already passed the Senate, and will be submitted to the voters next November.

On the same day, the Senate of New Jersey passed the Woman Suffrage Amendment to the State Constitution by a vote of 17 to 4. The amendment had previously passed the House unanimously, and will be submitted to the electors next fall.

Suffrage Bill Passed Iowa Senate on Lincoln's Birthday

ON Friday February 12, the Iowa State Senate passed the Woman Suffrage Resolution by a vote of 38 to 11. The resolution will be voted on at the polls in 1916.

Suffrage to be Kept Constantly before the Alabama Legislature During the Recess

MRS. SOLON JACOBS, President of the Alabama Equal Suffrage Association, announces that suffrage will be kept before the State Legislature during the time of its recess. Letters will be sent to all members in reference to the activities of the suffragists. Mrs. Jacobs predicts that when the legislature convenes in July suffrage will be submitted to the voters.

1510 H Street N. W.
WASHINGTON, D. C.

J. M. Gidding & Co.
Paris Cincinnati Duluth, Minn.

Fifth Avenue and 46th Street
New York

SUITS COATS BLOUSES NOVELTIES MILLINERY GOWNS WRAPS FURS

The European War and American Women Workers

By Florence Kelley

IN the state of Connecticut women employed in manufacture cannot legally be required or permitted to work after 10 P. M. In a great arms factory in New Haven women and girls are employed in polishing and buffing rifle barrels for war contracts. The day shift stops work at 6 P. M., and the night shift—employing approximately 700 women and girls—works from 6 P. M. to 10, the legal closing hour. They are then turned into a dance hall and entertainment place, where they eat supper, and amuse themselves until one minute after midnight. It is then the next day. The law has been complied with, and the night shift, resuming work, continues until 7 A. M.

It is needless to say that there are no chaperons in dance halls attached to arms factories. It is hard to conceive of anything more demoralizing than night work arranged with a long pause in the middle. It is also needless to point out that no women in Connecticut had anything to do with the selection, nomination, or election of the legislators, who enacted a night work law with no specified period of rest, no clearly set limit at which work might be legally resumed in the morning.

In Massachusetts the labor code is the slow growth of more than a half century of effort. Governor Walsh has for some months advocated bestowing upon some state official power to suspend all restrictions upon working hours in order, as he says, that manufacturers and workers may recoup the losses suffered in the early days of the war. There is grave danger that the Massachusetts labor code, the slow growth of years of care and effort, may be destroyed in a single winter.

In New York City thousands of skilled women workers have been unemployed because of the closing of the stock exchange, the long suspension of activity in Wall Street, the impossibility of bringing in imports, and the reduced purchasing power of all those consumers who live chiefly upon income derived from investments in industries unrelated to war contracts.

In New York, as in Massachusetts, these conditions have been peculiarly galling to thoughtful women, because in these states also women have had no share in electing legislators, state or national.

One possible mitigation of unemployment is the redistribution of the hours of labor by the establishment of the eight-hours day in wider reaches of industry, so that the maximum number of people may be engaged in any given field. This has been accomplished in five suffrage states, Washington, Oregon, California, Arizona, and Colorado; in Oregon by rulings of the Oregon Industrial Welfare Commission, and in the other states by the enactment of eight-hours laws. But in Connecticut, Massachusetts and New York, terrible as the unemployment has been, there is not even a public discussion of reduction of the working day to eight hours, or of the working week to forty-eight hours.

One of the ironies of periods of industrial depression is the coincidence of overwork and unemployment. Whenever the army of the unemployed is greatly increased, as it has been by the war, employers avail themselves of the excuse to reduce wages and lengthen working hours. It is perfectly simple to say, "If you do not like these terms, plenty of other people are waiting for your job"—and to this there is no reply. Thus the mitigation which seems the most obvious—the redistribution of work—is really less available in times of crisis than in ordinary times. Voluntary agreements between employers and employes are not in the direction of improvement, and the law fails when it is most urgently needed.

In the face of facts like these, it is harder than ever to understand how any thinking woman can be content not to strive to the uttermost for the immediate extension of the franchise to women by both methods—by pushing the state campaign, wherever one is in process, and by working in season and out of season for the adoption of the Bristow-Mondell amendment.

Early Work for the Federal Amendment

By the Rev. Olympia Brown

DEAR SUFFRAGISTS: A constant and faithreader of the *Suffragist,* I am always glad to find in its columns the record of the progress of our cause. In the issue of February 6th, I am especially pleased with the able article by Annie G. Porritt, and the "Points on the Federal Amendment," by Matilda H. Gardner. I note, however, running through both, a suggestion, no doubt unconsciously made, that the suffrage cause, or at least the present phase of it, is a new discovery, first made by the Congressional Union. For instance, Mrs. Porritt says, "the Congressional Union is the first suffrage association which is purely national in its scope." Now, the Federal Suffrage Association, which had a hearing before the House Committee on Election of President, Vice-President, and House Representatives, on the 17th of December last, is purely national in its scope, purpose and method of organization. It has been working ever since its first organization in 1892. It was this Federal Suffrage Association which secured the introduction of the suffrage bill, now called the Bristow-Mondell Amendment, in the Senate by Mr. Chamberlain, and in the House by Mr. Mondell, on April 7, 1913. In the words of another, "all of which I saw and a part of which I was."

In the "Points on the Federal Amendment," it is said, "Susan B. Anthony in 1875 first proposed and worked for a national amendment to give women the vote." Surely, long years before that, Susan B. Anthony was working for a constitutional amendment to give women the vote. The writer worked with Susan B. Anthony for such an amendment in the sixties, getting long lists of names; a thousand in the little village of Weymouth, Mass., was my own yearly aim in support of the national suffrage amendment. Such an amendment was the idea on which Mrs. Stanton and Miss Anthony always worked. At the first convention, held in Washington in 1869, Mrs. Stanton said, "The fundamental principle of our government, the equality of all citizens of the republic, should be incorporated in the federal Constitution." She said, "I hail the late discussions in Congress, and the various bills presented, as so many signs of progress. I am especially gratified with those bills presented by Messrs. Julian and Pomeroy, which forbid any state to deny the right of suffrage to any of its citizens on account of sex or color." Leaving out the word "color," this bill of Mr. Julian, presented in 1869, is precisely the same as the present Bristow-Mondell Amendment.

Woman suffrage in some form has been before Congress ever since 1866, at which time it was voted upon and gained nine votes—names ever to be remembered—Anthony, Brown, Buckalew, Cowan, Foster, Nesmith, Patterson, Riddle and Wade. In the following year, 1867, a similar bill was introduced in the House by Mr. Noell of Missouri. True, these bills of 1866 and 1867 applied only to the District of Columbia; but ever since 1869 some bill for the amendment of the Constitution of the United States, providing for the enfranchisement of all women citizens, has been constantly agitated, and presented again and again in Congress. These bills have not always had precisely the same form, but they have always embodied the same demand. The Sixteenth Amendment, enfranchising all the women of the United States, was the rallying cry of Miss Anthony and her co-workers from 1869, as long as she lived. The Sixteenth Amendment of Susan B. Anthony was the same as the Eighteenth Amendment of Senator Chamberlain, Senator Bristow and Mr. Mondell.

As a persistent advocate of woman's enfranchisement by congressional action, I take pride in the Congressional Union, and in its work. I look forward to its complete success in the passage at no distant day of a full suffrage amendment. The Congressional Union will then be the last, if it cannot be the first, to press the matter of national enfranchisement.

Over Half of the People in Washington
EAT CORBY'S BREAD--WHY?

Congressional Union for Woman Suffrage

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Miss Alice Paul, N. J., Chairman
Miss Lucy Burns, N. Y., Vice-Chairman
Mrs. Donald Hooker, Md., Chairman Finance
Mrs. Mary Beard, N. Y.
Mrs. O. H. P. Belmont, N. Y.
Mrs. Crystal Eastman Benedict, N. Y.
Mrs. Gilson Gardner, D. C.
Miss Elsie Hill, Conn.
Mrs. Wm. Kent, Cal.
Mrs. Lawrence Lewis, Jr., Pa.

Mrs. Harriot Stanton Blatch, N. Y.
Mrs. Inez Milholland Boissevain, N. Y.
Mrs. John Winters Brannan, N. Y.
Mrs. Edward N. Breitung, N. Y.
Reverend Olympia Brown, Wis.
Mrs. Winston Churchill, N. H.
Mrs. Lillian Harris Coffin, Cal.
Mrs. William L. Colt, N. Y.
Mrs. Frank Cothren, N. Y.
Mrs. George H. Day, Conn.
Mrs. John Dewey, N. Y.
Miss Mary Bartlett Dixon, Md.
Miss Lavinia Dock, N. Y.
Mrs. Abigail Scott Dunniway, Oregon
Mrs. Glendower Evans, Mass.
Mrs. Charlotte Perkins Gilman, N. Y.

ADVISORY COUNCIL

Mrs. Ines Haynes Gilmore, Cal.
Mrs. Edwin C. Grice, Pa.
Mrs. F. R. Hazard, N. Y.
Mrs. Phoebe A. Hearst, Cal.
Mrs. Florence Bayard Hilles, Del.
Mrs. Frederick C. Howe, N. Y.
Miss Ada L. James, Wis.
Miss Helen Keller, Mass.
Mrs. Florence Kelley, N. Y.
Dr. Cora Smith King, Wash.
Miss Gail Laughlin, Cal.
Mrs. William Bross Lloyd, Ill.
Miss Hazel Mackaye, Mass.
Miss Julia Marlowe, N. Y.
Mrs. Lionel S. Marks, Mass.
Miss Edythe Wynne Matthison, Conn

Miss Mary McDowell, Ill.
Mrs. Sophie G. Meredith, Va.
Mrs. Mary Hutcheson Page, Mass.
Mrs. Marsden Perry, R. I.
Mrs. Annie Porritt, Conn.
Mrs. William Prendergast, N. Y.
Mrs. John Rogers, N. Y.
Prof. Lucy M. Salmon, N. Y.
Mrs. Julius Stone, Ohio
Mrs. Mary O. Therkelsen, Ore.
Mrs. Thomas F. Walsh, D. C.
Mrs. Mina Van Winkle, N. J.
Mrs. John Jay White, D. C.
Miss Charlotte Anita Whitney, Cal.
Mrs. Harvey W. Wiley, D. C.
Mrs. S. M. B. Young, Mont.

National Headquarters—1420 F Street, Washington, D. C.

COLORS—PURPLE, WHITE AND GOLD

Senate Resolution 130, and House Resolution 1

Proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States extending the right of suffrage to women.

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress Assembled (two-thirds of each House concurring therein), That the following article be proposed to the legislatures of the several States as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which, when ratified by three-fourths of the said legislatures, shall be valid as part of said Constitution, namely:

"ARTICLE .—SEC. 1. The right of citizens of the United States to vote shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of sex.

"SEC. 2. Congress shall have power, by appropriate legislation, to enforce the provisions of this article."

HISTORY OF THE AMENDMENT

Introduced:

In the Senate: April 7, 1913, by Senator George E. Chamberlain, of Oregon.
In the House: April 7, 1913, by Representative Frank W. Mondell, of Wyoming.

Referred:

In the Senate: April 7, 1913, to the Woman Suffrage Committee.
In the House: April 7, 1913, to the Judiciary Committee.

Reported:

In the Senate: June 13, 1913, favorable report.
In the House: May 5, 1914. Reported without recommendation.

Discussed:

In the Senate: July 31, 1913, twenty-two Senators in favor, three opposing.
September 18, 1913, Senator Wesley L. Jones, of Washington, demanded immediate action.
On January 21, 1914, Senator Ashurst, of Arizona, delivered a speech urging the passage of the Amendment.
Made unfinished business, March 2, 1914.
Debated almost continuously from March 2d to March 19th.

Voted Upon:

In the Senate: March 19, 1914, thirty-five Senators in favor, thirty-four opposed, failing by eleven of the necessary two-thirds vote.
In the House: January 12, 1915, 174 in favor, 204 opposed; failing by 78 of the necessary two-thirds vote.

Reintroduced:

In the Senate: March 20, 1914, by Senator Bristow, of Kansas.

Reported:

In the Senate: April 7, 1914, favorable report

Present Status:

In the Senate: On Calendar of Senate.

CONCENTRATION

WHAT is best for suffrage workers to do in those states where a vote by the people is likely to be disastrous? Two or three of our Representatives in Congress who are Suffragists at heart voted against us because of the majority against suffrage among their constituents. It is likely enough that another vote in our State might not result any more favorably, but it has seemed to me, here on the ground, that the only thing to do was to keep on trying. A number of campaigns would probably result in sufficient education of the people so that we might eventually hope for success. But there is of course the disadvantage of having failure quoted against us. What do you think is best to do in such a case?"

Thus writes the President of the State Suffrage organization in one of the states where the submission of the woman suffrage question to a referendum of the men voters of the state, resulted in its defeat.

Her query brings us face to face with the whole problem of suffrage tactics.

To hasten the nation-wide enfranchisement of women, it is evident that we must plan a campaign covering all parts of the land. We must concentrate our attack on the points of least resistance and where the expenditure of effort will bring the greatest results.

According to the present "hit or miss" method of suffrage work, each state organization presses for the submission to the voters of its state of an amendment to its particular Constitution. As a consequence we are confronted with more state campaigns than can be handled. Money and speakers are scattered so thinly over the whole territory that a large proportion of the total campaigns is lost, as happened last November.

This dissipation of force not only imperils the winning of the more hopeful states, but, as was demonstrated in the recent vote in the House of Representatives, leads to an additional barrier against the National amendment, for an apparent mandate against that amendment is given to Congressmen from states where the referendum has been lost.

Under the present uncoordinated plan, some states are spending on their local activities thirty thousand to a hundred thousand dollars a year. On the other hand, Nevada, (for example,) had only seven thousand to spend during the whole three years of its campaign. And this was not because Nevada was considered a less promising field, but because it had no wealthy centers such as furnished the funds in other states. With much difficulty, Nevada women secured a little help from outside which enabled them to pull through. But there was no systematic arrangement by which Suffragists in all parts of the country could counsel together, and, realizing that Nevada, to take this particular instance, offered great likelihood for success, concentrate upon that state. Other hopeful states were lost because of this same lack of co-ordination of effort.

Above all, the national work suffers. In each state the workers devote themselves to their own state activities; either to bringing the suffrage question to a referendum or to winning the referendum when the measure has been submitted. The support of the national amendment is left to the District of Columbia and a few individuals scattered over the country.

There is certainly reason to believe that if our suffrage forces were concentrated on the national amendment, it could be carried before another year goes by. And there are states which could doubtless be won for suffrage if sufficient effort were expended within their borders. There are states, moreover, in which Presidential suffrage could probably be won if work were centered upon the legislatures. But certainly none of these ends can be attained if we are divided into thirty-eight groups—each intent only on its own ends and proceeding without any view of the whole. This is just the course that our enemies would desire. We remember the old military maxim, "Divide and conquer." Thus are our opponents dealing with us. On all sides we see more and more referendums threatening. We are even confronted with the possibility of an amendment to the National Constitution, through the Shafroth-Palmer bill, making every state a campaign state. We are facing an ever increasing dissipation of energy, speakers and funds, as the enemies of suffrage are coming to realize that one way to delay the suffrage movement is to involve us in exhausting referendum campaigns.

We appeal to Suffragists for concentration of effort.

Let us concentrate on the national amendment. With one-fourth of the United States Senate, one-sixth of the House and one-fifth of the electoral vote coming from suffrage states, the time is surely at hand when that amendment can be passed if we unite our money and our effort upon it.

As contributing to this end, let us work for Presidential suffrage through action by the state legislatures. Each state which attains this, strengthens us in the national political field by increasing the number of electoral votes coming from suffrage states. If such a measure is defeated by the legislature, it does not, on the other hand, have the disastrous effect upon the Representatives in Congress which results from a suffrage defeat at a referendum vote.

Finally, in so far as state campaigns are undertaken, let us concentrate on those states which, after full investigation, seem to justify effort.

We will then have a united, well-planned suffrage campaign, embracing the whole national field. The day of the complete political freedom of women will then be much nearer than if we work at cross purposes, spending money and effort where we happen to live instead of where such expenditure will promote the general good of our movement.

GOVERNMENT BY PARTIES

SUFFRAGISTS who are asking the party in power at Congress to initiate and pass a joint resolution referring to the State Legislatures the question of woman suffrage, are perpetually being told that the party, in power or out of power, has very little to do with their problem. We have no party government in the United States, we are told sometimes even by women who have had considerable experience in political work in their own State.

The history of the last few weeks at Congress should, I think, put an end forever to such a contention. The machinery of party politics has been displayed to public view with astonishing frankness. Both the Senate and the House have been asked by the leader of the party in power, the President of the United States, to consider a ship purchase bill. Everybody knows that this measure is being actively pushed from the White House. Republicans and Democrats have asserted it again and again and no one makes the attempt to deny it.

Senator O'Gorman said on February 9th (*Congressional Record*, page 3755), "The President of the United States, who is a frank and honest man, does not conceal the fact that in legislation he has resorted to every means which he considered legitimate to impose his will upon the Congress of the United States."

Senator Lodge (*Congressional Record*, page 3913) makes the same statement still more boldly: "The President has demanded the (shipping) bill. He has made the bill. He insists on its passage. He is in hourly consultation with Senators and, I have no doubt, with members of the House, in regard to it. He is just as much making the bill as anyone on this floor or in the House of Representatives; indeed he is doing far more than any one else."

THIS control of Congress by the Executive is no new thing, as the debate in the Senate has made perfectly clear. Senator Norris, a Progressive Republican very closely in sympathy with the Administration, said, on February 10th, (*Congressional Record*, page 3805) that no bill could pass Congress without the consent of the Administration. The railroad securities bill, Senator Norris said,—a bill promised the people in the Democratic national platform and already passed by the House, had been abandoned by the Administration and had, therefore, lost all chance of becoming law. "What is the reason this bill stops all at once?" said Mr. Norris. "Why is it? Why, after this bill has been reported by the Senate, has not anything further been done? * * * The Senator from Iowa (Mr. Cummins) said—and I think I have the same authority, although I did not get it quite as directly—that the instruction came from the President himself that nothing further should be done with that bill; and if it did not, why, when the President is able to carry anything else, has he laid down on the railroad bill? * * * I do not believe anybody here will say that the President of the United States wants the railroad securities bill passed at this session of Congress. If he had, we would have had it up long ago."

Senator Burton, speaking on February 13th (*Congressional Record*, page 4149), declared that it was the power of the Executive only which put through Congress the repeal of the Panama Canal Bill exempting vessels from tolls.

"Last year," said Senator Burton (*Congressional Record*, page 4149), "a measure came before the Senate for the repeal of the act exempting American ships in the coastwise trade from tolls in passing through the Panama Canal. In the year 1912—I very distinctly remember the occasion—a motion which I myself had offered in this body, to strike out that exemption, came to a vote. * * * What was the result of that motion? Eleven votes for it and 43 votes against it. A year ago last winter the President of the United States announced that he favored the repeal of that exemption. He had not taken that position in the preceding campaign. He had taken exactly the contrary position—that our boats should be exempt from tolls, and he had used some expression in regard to the platform not being 'molasses to catch flies.' In the most unequivocal terms he had favored that exemption on the stump when a candidate for the Presidential office and when the people were making up their minds how to vote. But a year ago last winter he changed his mind. * * *

"Mr. President, I have every reason to suppose that except for Executive action that exemption would be in the law today. The President of the United States, however, took a hand in it, and every one within the sound of my voice knows how strong that pressure was."

THE machinery at the disposal of the President for enforcing his will upon Congress has also been most frankly discussed. The President himself, in his Indianapolis speech, said in plain terms, if any "group of men should dare break the solidarity of the Democratic team *for any purpose or from any motive* theirs will be a most unenviable notoriety and a responsibility which will bring deep bitterness to them. The only party that is serviceable to a nation is a party that can hold absolutely together and march with the discipline and the zest of a conquering host. * * * Team work all the time is what they (the people) are going to demand of us, and that is our individual, as well as our collective responsibility. * * * If a man will not play in the team then he does not belong in the team. You see, I have spent a large part of my life in college and I know what a team means when I see it; and I know what the captain of a team must have if he is going to win. So it is no idle figure with me."

The seven independent members of the President's team who have protested against this interpretation of their individual duty declare that the President enforces his will through the operation of the party caucus. Senator Hitchcock said (*Congressional Record*, page 3749), "We are first invited into a conference and told that it is to be a meeting for the purpose of enabling Democrats to discuss their various differences upon the pending bill for the purpose of seeing to what extent a common purpose may be reached, and after we have entered such a conference, believing it to be a conference, it is suddenly transformed into a caucus and by a vote we are told that we are bound hand and foot and denied the privilege upon the floor of this Senate of either offering amendments or supporting amendments to the question. We are told we have not the privilege of dotting an *i* or crossing a *t*, or in any way of altering what the majority of the aforesaid caucus may have decided. * * * Mr. President, objectionable as the caucus may be when men go into it determined to vote for the things they believe in and thus possibly to bind and control some of their colleagues, it becomes infinitely worse for Democratic Senators in a caucus to vote against their convictions on matters before the caucus and then seek to bind a dozen or more of their colleagues to suppress their convictions also. That is the case now. Democratic Senators having abandoned their conviction, seek to compel their more independent coleagues also to abandon theirs.

"And I say it now upon the floor of this Senate solemnly as my belief that not one-half of the Senators upon the Democratic side of the Chamber believe in this bill as it is now before the Senate. Am I to be bound by their votes when I personally know that many of them have not followed their own convictions? * * * The Senator from Missouri (Mr. Stone) here the other day revealed to the Senate and to the public the fact that * * * only 35 Senators voted to make that conference a binding conference upon the members. The Democratic membership is 53, and 35 is not two-thirds of 53. For that reason, in order to make it binding and in order to clamp on the irons, it was necessary for one Senator to change his vote. That situation almost approaches the standard of a comic opera, Mr. President, if it were not so serious. To think that one Senator who had solemnly voted 'No' as to whether the bill should be made a party measure, reversed his mental processes and voted 'Yes,' and thereby turned the whole Democratic Party over to a new and revolutionary doctrine."

THE essential thing for suffragists to learn from these statements is that these methods of legislative work form the rule in Congressional procedure and not the exception to the rule. Each party in turn uses caucus methods when it is in power. Leading Republicans and Democrats declare that party team work is really necessary for the enactment of legislation and really valuable to the people, because it concentrates reponsibility on the party in power and enables the people to mete out praise or blame to responsible party leaders. Senator Root declared

1510 H Street N. W.
WASHINGTON, D. C.
SUITS
COATS
J. M. Gidding & Co.
Paris Cincinnati Duluth, Minn.
Fifth Avenue and 46th Street
New York
WRAPS
FURS
BLOUSES NOVELTIES MILLINERY GOWNS

frankly (*Congressional Record*, page 2838), "I am not one of those who denounce caucuses and attempts to secure united party action. In my own conception of a government by political parties, membership in a party involves certain obligations to attempt agreement upon that united party action which is necessary to discharge party responsibilities. I do not think that the declaration of affiliation with a political party should be regarded as merely a means of obtaining office, to be forgotten after office is obtained. I think that when by declaring himself a member of a political party a man has secured an election to office by his fellow-citizens, he has assumed toward them an obligation to seek to do his part toward discharging the responsibility of his party in putting into effect the policies which it declares."

Senator Reed (*Congressional Record*, page 3752) said:

"This has been from the first a Government of political parties. I say without qualification that it is my opinion that when it ceases to be a Government by political parties the liberties of the American people will be well-nigh at an end. There are certain great forces in this world that are always in combination, that are always active, that always move in concert. Whether they are bound by actual agreement or are held together, to adopt a thread-bare phrase, by "the cohesive power of public plunder," they are, nevertheless, constantly acting together. They sleep neither day nor night; they are actuated by the motive of profit. I make no bitter assault upon them; I simply state the facts. The only force that can meet and control and, when necessary, overthrow those great interests is a force of men. The only way a body of men can be made effective is to bring them together in some kind of organization. The moment you begin organization of men, you necessarily require the surrender of many individual preferences and the subornation of personal opinions. * * *

"I question whether there has ever been a political platform written by a convention where a majority of the delegates were contented with the entire platform. I question whether there has ever been a political platform yet that, if you had submitted it to the individual opinion of the delegates, you would not have found that 95 per cent of them took exception to some part of it or would have added to or subtracted from it. Necessarily, when you go into a political convention, you do so for the purpose of trying to concentrate the minds of the delegates upon a few propositions; and that necessarily means that mutual concessions must be made. Now, we carry that platform to the people of the Nation and ask the support of millions of voters. It is absolutely unthinkable that all the men who vote for a party approve every part of its platform or that it expresses their exact ideas. Accordingly the members of political parties, from the leaders to the rank and the file, must compromise and must yield. And, finally, bearing the commission of a political party, Senators come here and, sir, it is the duty of those who come here bearing the warrant and badge of authority from a constituency to carry out the will of that constituency as it has been expressed. When Senators come here they come as accredited agents of great political parties, and they step at once into an organization which already exists.

"Every Democrat who is elected to this Senate becomes, by virtue of his election, a member of the Democratic organization in the Senate. He becomes ipso facto a unit in the party council, namely, the Democratic conference or caucus. By that party conference, or by those whom that party conference selects, he is even assignd his very seat in this body. From it he receives the quarters in which he makes his offices. He owes to that organization his position on every committee on which he serves. If you deny the right of the caucus to exist, you thereby deny the right of party council; you deny the right or opportunity to arrive at a common opinion; you destroy utterly the power of our party to move en mass. When you have destroyed the power of a party in Congress to so move you have also destroyed the power of the sovereign voters of the United States to unite in the accomplishment of their desires. This is so because the people can not be heard as individuals. They can only speak through their representatives in the Congress of the United States, who assemble from all parts of the land in obedience to the votes of men who, believing alike and acting in concert, send their agents here to also act in concert, in carrying out their mandate. When you have denied the people that kind of representation you have deprived them of the power of self-government. I repeat that it is only through the two branches of the National Legislature that the people can engrave upon the tablets of the law the principles in which they believe. If, therefore, these representatives, selected by voters who have a common belief, insist each in going his own way, refusing to act with his party associates, the party and its principles go to ruin and the arms of the people are paralyzed."

THE belief in the importance of party loyalty finds amazing expression in the bitter accusations hurled at the seven independent Democrats who voted against the Administration bill. Senator Stone of Missouri on February 3 (*Congressional Record*, page 3239) said:

"Suppose a faction of some company of French or German soldiers should * * * plot together to aid the enemy and betray their comrades. * * * What would the comrades of such betrayers think of them? * * *

"Mr. President, what was the situation up to the hour when this unexpected blow was struck? The shipping bill was before the Senate as the unfinished business and had been for two weeks. The majority Members of this body in conference had determined to make it the unfinished business and keep it the unfinished business until every possibly expedient had been exhausted to enact it into law. To that end we made it a party measure. * * * Now, Mr. President, let me read from the caucus record made on January 23d of this year:

"'* * * Resolved, that in the judgment of this Democratic conference, the bill S. 6856 (the Ship Purchase Bill) as amended and agreed upon by this conference, should be enacted, and that it is the judgment of the conference that said bill should be continued as the unfinished business of the Senate and that it should be supported as a party measure.' There were 36 yeas, two-thirds of all the Democratic members of the Senate. After that vote was cast—36 to 2—on the motion of a Senator the vote adopting the resolution was made unanimous. * * * The Senator from Arkansas stated he did not know we were going to hold a conference."

Mr. Clarke of Arkansas: "A caucus."

Mr. Stone: "A caucus. I got the usual notice sent out—"

Mr. Clarke of Arkansas: "Will the Senator let me put into the record the notice sent to me, if it does not disturb him?" * * * It is as follows:

United States Senate Chamber,
Washington, D. C., January 22, 1915.

There will be a meeting of the Democratic Senators in the Finance Committee Room, Senate Office Building, room No. 312, on Saturday, January 23, 1915, at 11 o'clock A. M.

Thomas W. Keller,
Assistant Doorkeeper.

Mr. Stone: "Mr. President, that is a printed notice, except as to the date, which is inserted in a blank left for that purpose. This is the same notice in words and terms that has been sent out assembling Democrats ever since I have been a member of this body. What do Democrats assemble for? What do we assemble for under these notices? Not merely to sit around in social converse, discussing anything that may happen to be suggested by talkative Senators. We assemble for a purpose; and if the Senator from Arkansas did not know for what purpose we were called together when he got that notice, he is the only Senator on this side of the Chamber who did not. We met there to confer about this bill." * * *

Mr. Camden: "I will reply now that I never attended a conference, and if the Senator from Missouri was there he might have known it."

Mr. Stone: "Never attended a conference? What is the significance of that? Does the Senator contend that because he did not meet in conference with his party associates—that because he was absent from a meeting—he is absolved from the obligations that rest upon a loyal party man?"

IT may be urged that the party system, powerful as it is, has broken down in this instance, since the shipping bill is not yet a law. But the measure would certainly have been adopted except for the vigorous filibuster of the Republican minority; and may yet become a law if the President calls an extra session to wear down the opposition.

The right to filibuster hardly exists in the House, which is absolutely obedient to the will of the Administration. As a matter of fact, this very measure, which has been little considered by the people at large and has never been embodied in the political platform of any great party, passed the House in one day. The Democrats were brought to obedience by the following exalted appeal from Mr. Champ Clark:

"You wandered in the wilderness for sixteen years and you will wander there again unless you follow the leader of the party. This is no time to bolt. The President wants this bill and it is probably as good a bill as could be framed even if we delayed matters. I am opposed to government ownership, but this is an emergency measure. The House should do everything possible to expedite action and avoid an extra session. If there is an extra session the Democratic party will be wiped off the face of the earth at the next election."

Even in the Senate, the filibuster against Administration decisions is doomed to speedy extinction, and that on no unworthy grounds. The filibuster is a weapon which can be used by a determined minority against the decision of an automatic party majority. Nevertheless, it is a weapon of the minority against the majority and therefore in our present system of Government, indefensible. Senator Norris, a man known in the Senate for purity of motive and breadth of view, is taking a leading fight in enacting legislation forbidding the filibuster. Senator Kenyon, another Progressive Republican, takes the same position: "The appeal from the majority here is to the country," he said today, "and not to the minority. The responsibility for legislation is upon the majority, not the minority. And no matter how the minority may believe it is right, the majority's responsibility should not be shouldered by a minority. The country will be able to make up a verdict that will finally decide what it wants."

THERE is no escape from the conclusion that our Government is a Government by parties; that the party in power holds in its hands almost unlimited power to control legislation; and that unless this were true the business of the country could not be efficiently attended to. The appeal of the people for desired reforms must be made to the party in power and not to any member of the minority party, who belongs to a group temporarily helpless. The responsibility for the progress of reform during a given Administration rests absolutely with the party in power during that Administration. Theirs is the praise if the desired legislation is enacted; theirs alone is the blame if it is neglected and ignored.

Women today must unceasingly demand that the Democratic Party initiate and press through Congress the Federal Woman Suffrage amendment; and they must highly resolve to hold that party alone responsible if their present disfranchisement continues.

CAMPAIGN THROUGH THE COUNTRY

Delaware House of Representatives Reports Suffrage Amendment Favorably

Delaware Headquarters: 305 *Delaware Avenue, Wilmington.*
Chairman: *Mrs. Florence Bayard Hilles.*
Organizers: *Miss Mabel Vernon, Miss Anna McCue, Mrs. Edna S. Latimer.*

DELAWARE, the little State that many have believed entirely devoid of suffrage sentiment, is today fairly seething with enthusiasm for Votes For Women; and the Delaware Legislature, now in session, is learning that one of the most important questions presented for consideration is the constitutional amendment enfranchising women. This question is left entirely in the hands of the legislators, for Delaware is the only State of the Union where a constitutional amendment is not referred to the people. For the passage of any amendment a two-thirds favorable vote of two successive legislatures is required—and that is all.

Miss Anna McCue

Shortly before the 1915 session of the legislature opened a Delaware Campaign Committee of the Congressional Union was formed to conduct a vigorous campaign in the Diamond State. Mrs. Florence Bayard Hilles, a daughter of Thomas F. Bayard, the first Ambassador to Great Britain and Cleveland's Secretary of State, is the chairman of this committee; Miss Edith Spruance, a member of an old Delaware family, is the treasurer, and Miss Mabel Vernon the organizer. Since it was learned that members of the legislature knew little of the desires of their constituents in regard to the suffrage question, an active campaign was immediately started by having delegations of women in each district interview the legislators from that district, to ask their support of the suffrage amendment.

Miss Mabel Vernon

In order to cover the State thoroughly and quickly with suffrage propaganda, the Votes For Women Flyer, a gaily decorated automobile flying the purple, gold and white of the Congressional Union, started out from Wilmington on January 28, with Mrs. Edna S. Latimer, of Baltimore, as conductor, and Miss Anna McCue, Congressional Union organizer, and Miss Helen Cranston, daughter of Mrs. Martha Cranston, the veteran president of the Delaware Suffrage Association, as her assistants. The Flyer has now practically covered the entire State, and the workers have found there is tremendous sentiment among the people of Delaware, simply needing to be made evident to legislators. Suffrage meetings have been held in seventy towns, 8,000 people have listened to suffrage speeches, about 20,000 pieces of suffrage literature have been distributed, and contributions have been collected almost sufficient to cover expenses. Few have been found who had objections to woman suffrage to offer in public.

During the Flyer's trip the scarcity of "antis" and the abundance of suffragists was shown by the fact that 1,200 men and women signed the already large petition asking the legislature to pass the suffrage amendment. A careful canvass has been made of the seventeen senators and thirty-five representatives in the Delaware Legislature and hearings have been conducted before the Revised Statutes Committee of Senate and House, to which the suffrage bill was referred. The first triumph for the suffragists was scored last Tuesday when the House Committee gave the suffrage bill a favorable report.

Mrs. Edna S. Latimer

All indications now both in the legislature and among the people, give great encouragement that Delaware will soon be numbered among the States that have granted suffrage to women.

District of Columbia

Headquarters: 1420 *F Street.*
Organizer: *Miss Isabella Mott.*

WE are busy organizing workers to be available during the extra session of Congress, which now seems a certainty. A large number of active workers is necessary, as we shall have several big demonstrations to impress the new Congressmen with the importance of the Bristow-Mondell Amendment. Mrs. Ida Waters, who has been speaking frequently in Washington all winter, will speak several times a week at our daily street meetings. Mrs. Waters was formerly an organizer for the Woman Suffrage Party of New York, and is considered one of the most gifted outdoor speakers in the East. Our regular Tuesday evening meeting is postponed until Sunday, the 28th. On that day Mrs. John Jay White is giving all the members of the Union a tea at Studio House, as a climax to the Anthony memorial fund campaign. A program of the tea, at which we expect several widely known speakers, will be given in the *Suffragist* next week.—*Isabella Mott.*

Colorado

Colorado Headquarters: 324 17*th Street, Denver.*
Organizer: *Miss Ruth Astor Noyes.*

DR. MARGARET LONG, a well-known physician of Denver, who has resided and practiced in Denver for about ten years, joined our Union on Saturday, together with Dr. Mary Gale. They are both interested in our work, and I believe we will soon have a group of about twenty-five or thirty doctors.

Treasurer's Report

Make All Checks Payable to
The Treasurer of the Congressional Union
1420 F St., Washington, D. C.
This Will Save Much Inconvenience

HAVE you contributed to the Susan B. Anthony Fund?

There are about ten thousand readers of the *Suffragist*. Each of us reveres the memory of Miss Anthony. In no better way can we testify to our appreciation of all she has done for us than by contributing to this memorial fund to continue her work for the national amendment, now popularly known as the Anthony Amendment. If each reader will raise or give a dollar in honor of Miss Anthony we will have a fund which will make possible a campaign even more vigorous than that conducted in the past. Miss Anthony made many sacrifices that we might have the opportunities which, as women, we possess today. We can each give at least a dollar, in tribute to her memory, to this birthday fund. Send in *your* dollar today.

CONTRIBUTIONS TOWARD $100,000 FUND FOR SECURING THE PASSAGE OF THE FEDERAL SUFFRAGE AMENDMENT

(*Fund opened December 7th, 1912. Donations, membership fees and tickets are here listed; receipts from the purely business departments of "The Suffragist" and the Literature Committee are not included.*)

LIST OF CONTRIBUTIONS FROM FEBRUARY 6 THROUGH FEBRUARY 15

Miss Louise Fox	$1.00
Mrs. Carl M. Vail	1.00
Mrs. Edward Lukens	1.00
Mrs. K. A. Williams	1.00
Mrs. A. B. Moorfield	1.00
Mrs. Frank H. Sommer	1.00
Mr. F. T. Runyon	2.00
Mrs. S. C. Greenough	5.00
Mrs. J. G. Greenough	5.00
Miss Cornelia Greenough	5.00
Mrs. Frederick K. Stearns	50.00
Mrs. Paul F. Johnson	25.00
Mrs. W. F. Dowell (Collected)	15.00
Mrs. Dora Haynes	5.00
Hon. William Kent	10.00
Anonymous	6.00
Anonymous	5.00
Miss Janet Richards	5.00
Dr. Kate S. Stanton	5.00
Mrs. Cora E. Johnson	25.00
Miss Ethel F. King	10.00
Mrs. Hazel B. Ewing	25.00
Mrs. Katherine G. Halligan	100.00
Miss Lola C. Trax	5.00
Mrs. Mary Wilson	1.00
Mrs. L. W. Therkelsen	5.00
A Friend	1.00
Mrs. J. Borden Estee	20.00
Mrs. Frances A. Ackermann	25.00
Miss Anna Constable	25.00
Miss Julia Hurlbut (Collected)	.10
Mrs. Thomas S. Creighton	2.00
Mrs. Thomas J. Williams	10.00
Miss Fannie T. Cochran	100.00
Julia Marlowe-Sothern	15.00
Mr. Alexander T. Hersey	2.00
Mrs. N. B. Ells	2.00
Mrs. H. S. Luscomb	2.00
Susan B. Anthony Fund.	
Per Miss Isabelle Mott, Chairman.	
Miss Elizabeth Smith	1.00
Miss Grace L. Taylor	1.00
Miss Cooley	1.00
Mrs. Wessler	.25
Mrs. Maude Meigs Brearley	2.00
Mrs. Maria B. Dobyns	2.00
Mrs. Perkins	5.00
Mrs. William S. Love	1.50
Miss Alice Jenkins	1.00
Mrs. E. M. Evarts	1.00
Miss Gertrude Clemons	1.00
Mrs. M. L. Sutten	5.00
Miss Gertrude Crocker	1.00
Miss May Dabney	1.00
Miss Helen Monroe	5.00
Mrs. Edward L. Gies	1.00
Miss Sara P. Grogan	2.00
Mrs. Louis Fitzhenry	1.00
Miss Margery Critten	2.00
Mrs. J. I. Blakslee	2.00
Mrs. D. F. Botsford	.50
Miss Gertrude Leonard	1.00
Miss Catherine McAvoy	.50
Mrs. J. C. Kelton	1.00
Mrs. A. P. Clark, Jr.	2.00
Mrs. Charles Edward Russel	1.00
Miss Viola Thorwarth	1.00
Miss N. L. Atherton	1.00
L. T.	5.00
Anonymous	5.00
Mrs. William A. Martin	2.00
Miss Jessie Baker	5.00
Dr. Arrah B. Evarts	2.00
Mrs. James Irwin Chamberlain	2.00
Mrs. Herbert A. Smith	1.00
Miss Louise H. Bliss	2.00
Miss Ellen C. Church	2.00
Mrs. Henry Salon Graves	1.00
Dr. Mary W. Eaton	1.00
Mrs. Gilson Gardner (Collected)	5.00
Miss Katherine R. Fisher	1.00
Miss Hammet	1.00
Miss Pearl B. Clendening	5.00
Mrs. J. B. Newman	1.00
Miss Eliza H. Lord (Collected)	1.00
Mrs. George Odell	1.00
Mrs. George Odell (Collected)	1.00
Mrs. Claudia Geary	1.00
Miss Elizabeth Geary	1.00
Collections	16.61
Membership fees	9.75
Sale of tickets	6.60
Total	$647.81
Previously acknowledged in *The Suffragist*.	55,188.37
Total through February 15, 1915	$55,836.18

One Thousand New Subscribers

ONE of our members in sending in a subscription to the paper for herself and another for the Public Library of her city, writes: "Congratulations to the Congressional Union on its success in forcing the vote on the Constitutional amendment in the House of Representatives. Credit is certainly due the Union for their 'tenacity'." We suggest to all other members that they translate into action their belief in the Congressional Union methods by rendering some personal service, such as the spread-in of the paper as this member has done.

Members Who Have Secured New Subscribers

FEBRUARY 6 TO FEBRUARY 15

(*In this column we list the subscribers sent in each week by our members. These are only a part of the total number of new subscriptions.*)

Miss Rachel S. Howland	2
Miss Lucy Burns	1
Mrs. Mary S. Phelps	1
Mrs. Abby Scott Baker	1
Mrs. Mary O. Stevens	2
Miss Alice Paul	1
Mrs. John Dewey	3
Miss Doris Stevens	6
Mrs. Lawrence Lewis, Jr.	1
	18
Previously acknowledged in *The Suffragist*	560
Total	578

New Members

AMONG the new members who have joined the Congressional Union during the week are Miss Emma L. Johnston, Principle of the Brooklyn Training School for Teachers; Miss Anna L. Buchanan, the Assistant Principal; Miss Kate E. Turner, Assistant Principal of the High School in Brooklyn; Miss Laura G. Lovett, Superintendent of Schools of Hill County, Montana; Mrs. Sara Walrath Lyons, lecturer and writer at the American Institute of Social Service; and Miss Annia S. Peck, who has won national fame as a mountain climber.

Telephone Main 673
Lanman Engraving Co.
HALF TONES, ZINC ETCHINGS
PROCESS ENGRAVERS
POST BUILDING Washington, D. C.

Phone Main 8384 Toilet Articles
GERTRUDE CLEMENS
Expert Shampooing and Hairdressing
Room 232 Oxford Building, 726 14th Street N.W.
Manicuring—Hair Work Facial and Scalp Treatment
Open Evenings Until Seven

DR. MARY WALKER EATON
Osteopathic Physician
Specializing in WOMEN'S and CHILDREN'S DISEASES
THE KEDRICK
Telephone Main 8336 1801 K Street N. W.
Office and Resident appointments any hour

Extra!
Extra Floor Space March 1—an Entire Floor—Better Facilities —same Top-notch C-P-Co. Service—"We Grow 'Cause We Know"
COLUMBIAN PRINTING CO., Inc.
815 Fourteenth Street

ONE of our Leading Suffragists says "COLONIAL CANDIES" are the best in Washington at any price
TRY OUR FAMOUS BUTTER CREAMS
All home made candies 40c the pounds. Bring this ad and we will give to the cause one cent on every pound sold. (Packages carefully packed for parcel post delivery)
1421 F Street N. W.—908 New York Ave. N. W.
Washington, D. C.

"THE BUSY CORNER"
S. Kann Sons & Co.
8TH ST. AND PENNA. AVE.
OPEN 8:30 A. M.—CLOSE 5:30 P. M.

JET SEQUIN TRIMMING
One of the Most Popular of the Moment
Nearly all women have a weakness for jet trimming. It can express both the serious and the sparkling moods of the wearer in its brilliant darkness. All the new ways of using jet have their showing here.
JET SEQUIN FLOUNCING, about 27 inches wide, at a yard, $5.79 and.. $5.95
NARROWER FLOUNCING, designed for making bodices and for trimmings, at a yard, $1.50 to $2.95
JET SEQUIN BANDINGS, from ½ to 4 inches wide, at a yard, 15c to.... $3.00
JET CHAIN TRIMMING for festoon effects; a yard, 39c to..... 59c
JET TASSELS AND PENDANTS, the single tassel or ornament, priced from 10c to..... $1.69
Trimming Store—Street Floor.